UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,675	10/10/2006	Thierry Royer	0549-1017	2776

466   7590   09/03/2008
YOUNG & THOMPSON
209 Madison Street
Suite 500
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
SMITH, BENJAMIN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/03/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/578,675	ROYER, THIERRY
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Benjamin J. Smith	2176	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 October 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *10 October 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This non-final office action is in response to the Application filed on 10/10/2006, with a priority date of 11/05/2003.

Claims 1-20 are presented for examination. Claims 1 and 8 are independent claims.

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Objections

Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities:

The phrase "System according to claim 1" in line 1 should be amended to -- ~~System~~ Method according to claim 1 – because Claim 11 is dependent on Claim 1 and Claim 1 is a method claim, not a system claim.

Claims 1, 3-5, 8-9 and 12-20:

The claims are replete with antecedent basis issues. Most, but not all, of these issues concern the use of the word "image". It appears that the applicant initially used the word "graphic" (Claims 1 and 8, line 6) and then changed to the use of the word "image".

The following is a list of some of the claims and their terms that lack proper antecedent basis.

Claim 1: Line 9, "the image".

Claim 1: Line 13, "the image".

Claim 1: Line 15, "the contents".

Claim 3: Line 3, "the image".

Claim 3: Line 6, "the image".

Claim 4: Line 2, "the image".

Claim 5: Line 7, "the entire image".

Claim 5: Line 11, "the displayed image".

Claim 8: Line 8, "the image".

Claim 8: Line 12, "the image".

Claim 9: Line 8, "the image".

Claim 12: Line 3, "the interconnection".

Claim 13: Line 7, "the data transmission network".

Claim 14: Line 2, "the image".

Claim 15: Line 5, "the page".

Claim 16: Line 5, "the page".

Claim 17: Line 10, "the displayed image".

Claim 18: Line 10, "the displayed image".

Claim 19: Line 10, "the displayed image".

Claim 20: Line 5, "the alphanumeric characters".

Claim 20: Line 5, "the main size".

Claim 20: Line, "the image".

Claims 2, 6, 7, 14 and 15:

The claims are also unclear for the use of "image" in different contexts in different elements and then later making reference to "the image" without reference to which preceding image is being referred to.

The following is a list of some of the claims with the issue of an unclear "image" reference.

Claim 2: line 9, "the image" could refer to "an image" of Claim 2 or "the image" of Claim 1.

Claim 6: line 6, "the image" could refer to "an image" of Claim 6 or "the image" of Claim 1.

Claim 7: line 6, "the images" could refer to "images" in Claim 7, lines 3 or 5; or the plural of "image" in Claim 1.

Claim 14: (depends from Claim 2) line 2, "the image" could refer to "an image" of Claim 2 or "the image" of Claim 1.

Claim 14: (depends from Claim 2) line 6, "the image" could refer to "an image" of Claim 2, "an image" of Claim 14 or "the image" of Claim 1.

Claim 15: (depends from Claim 2) line 2, "the image" could refer to "an image" of Claim 2 or "the image" of Claim 1.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 8-10 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 8:

The language of the claims raise a question as to whether the claims are directed merely to an abstract idea that would not result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

In summary, Claim 8 recites a "*system*" solely comprising an adaptation module. An embodiment of the adaptation module is simply a piece of software, as described in the Specification (see paragraph 0037). Thus, for purposes of examination, the examiner interprets the recited "*system*" to be software per se. That is, the recited "*system*" is not a process, a machine, a manufacture or a composition of matter.

Accordingly, Claim 8 fails to recite statutory subject matter as defined in 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 9, 10, 12 and 13 merely recite additional features of the adaptation module. Thus, Claims 9, 10, 12 and 13 do not further define the recited "*system*" as being within a statutory process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter.

Accordingly, Claims 9, 10, 12 and 13 fail to recite statutory subject matter as

defined in 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

The term "image band" in claims 3 and 14 is a relative term which renders the

claim indefinite. The term "image band" is not defined by the claim, the specification

does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite meaning, and one of ordinary

skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public
use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United
States.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13 and 16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) based

upon a public use or sale of the invention by Formanek et al. US Patent Publication No.

2003/0014445 (hereinafter, "Formanek").

Claim 1:

Formanek discloses a *method for adapting a document so as to make it viewable*

on a terminal (11) having limited display capabilities [paragraph 0013, lines 1-14] [reflow

document for display on a PDA], *which method includes the following steps of :*

-determining (21) processing and display capabilities of the

terminal [paragraph 0040, lines 2-8] [determining the resolution is determining the

processing and display properties],

-converting (23) a page of a document into a graphic or semi- graphic format chosen on

the basis of the processing and/or display capabilities of the terminal [paragraph 0026,

lines 1-5] [generating an image is converting to graphic format], *and*

-at least partially transmitting (25, 27) the image of the

converted document page to the terminal [paragraph 0026, lines 5-10] [transferred to

PDA],

characterized in that it includes steps consisting of analyzing (22, 30) the document

page to be displayed by the terminal (11) so as to determine its characteristics

[paragraph 0043, lines 1-16] [determine if font point size is out of normal range],

wherein the image resulting from the conversion has a resolution selected on the basis

of the characteristics of the document, so that the contents of the document page can

be read on the screen of the terminal [paragraph 0043, lines 1-16] [image generated

based on the scaling factor for the font size].

Claim 3:

Formanek discloses the method *characterized in that it also includes a step (26) of extracting, from the image resulting from the conversion, a band of which the dimensions correspond to the maximum dimensions of an image capable of being displayed by the terminal* [paragraph 0040, lines 8-12 and paragraph 0030, lines 7-9] [maximum display width determined and target resolution, the band is the resultant image with limited width]*, and of which the orientation in the image corresponds to the reading axis of the document page, which image band is transmitted to the terminal* [paragraph 0045, lines 9-12 and fig. 4] [discloses the reading flow, or axis, in the same fashion, or orientation, as the original document].

Claim 4:

Formanek discloses the method *characterized in that the resolution of the image generated by the conversion of a document page is determined on the basis of the size of alphanumeric characters present in the document page and on the basis of the dimensions of the page* [paragraph 0040, lines 8-18 and paragraph 0042, lines 1-13] [text font size is the equivalent of the size of alphanumeric characters].

Claim 6:

Formanek discloses the method *characterized in that if the document page is an image representing text, the analysis of the document page includes steps of recognizing the alphanumeric characters present in the document page* [paragraph

0032, lines 1-10] [OCR software can identify the location of text and graphic blocks] *and determining a main size of the recognized alphanumeric characters, with the resolution of the image generated by the conversion of a document page being determined on the basis of the main size obtained* [paragraph 0043, lines 1-16] [non-standard size text such as headlines can be converted to normal size text].

Claim 7:

Formanek discloses the method *characterized in that the analysis of the document page consists of separating images and text contained on the page* [paragraph 0032, lines 1-10] [OCR software can identify the location of text and graphic blocks]*, wherein the conversion of the document page consists of generating, based on the text, images in an adapted format* [paragraph 0043, lines 1-16] [non-standard size text such as headlines can be converted to normal size text in the bit map image]*, and converting the format of the images so that they can be viewed on the terminal* [paragraph 0044, lines 1-11] [graphic determined and resolution adjusted].

Claim 8:

Formanek discloses a *system for adapting a document so as to make it viewable on a terminal having limited display capabilities* [paragraph 0013, lines 1-14] [reflow document for display on a PDA]*, which system includes an adaptation module (15) comprising means (13) for determining processing and display capabilities of a terminal (11)* [paragraph 0040, lines 2-8] [determining the resolution is determining the

processing and display properties], *and means (17) for converting a page of a*

document into a graphic or semi-graphic format selected on the basis of the processing

and display capabilities of the terminal [paragraph 0026, lines 1-5] [generating an image

is converting to graphic format], *which system also includes means for at least partially*

transmitting the image of the converted document page to the terminal [paragraph 0026,

lines 5-10] [transferred to PDA],

characterized in that the adaptation module (15) also includes means (18) for analyzing

the document page to be displayed by the terminal (11), so as to determine its

characteristics [paragraph 0043, lines 1-16] [determine if font point size is out of normal

range], *wherein the image resulting from the conversion has a resolution selected on*

the basis of the characteristics of the document, so that the contents of the document

page can be read on the display screen of the terminal [paragraph 0043, lines 1-16]

[image generated based on the scaling factor for the font size].

Claim 12:

    Formanek discloses a system *characterized in that the adaptation module (15) is*

integrated in a gateway (4) providing the interconnection between a mobile telephone

network (2) to which the terminals are capable of being connected, and a data

transmission network (5) providing access to documents capable of being viewed on the

terminals [paragraph 0025, lines 15-20] [a proxy server delivers web pages or web

document to a PDA, a proxy server and a gateway are equivalent].

Claim 13:

Formanek discloses a system *characterized in that the adaptation module*

(15) is integrated in a specialized server (10) connected to a data transmission network

(5) providing access to documents capable of being viewed on the terminals (11)

[paragraph 0025, lines 15-20] [a proxy server is a specialized server connected to the

internet that delivers web pages or web document to a PDA], *wherein the terminals are*

mobile terminals capable of being connected to a mobile telephone network (2)

interconnected with the data transmission network [paragraph 24, lines 11-14] [PDA is a

mobile terminal that contains a cell phone and is connected to a mobile telephone

network and a data transmission network].

Claim 16:

Formanek discloses the method *characterized in that the resolution of the image*

generated by the conversion of a document page is determined on the basis of the size

of alphanumeric characters present in the document page and on the basis of the

dimensions of the page [paragraph 0040, lines 8-18 and paragraph 0042, lines 1-13]

[text font size is the equivalent of the size of alphanumeric characters].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10 and 11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over

Formanek.

Claim 10:

Formanek discloses the claimed features in Claim 8 (shown above).

Formanek discloses a system *characterized in that the adaptation module is*

integrated in a web server (12) delivering documents to mobile terminals (11)

[paragraph 0025, lines 15-20] [a proxy server delivers web pages or web document to a

PDA].

The service that a proxy server provides may be easily integrated into a web

server. This integration is possible because proxy servers often provide the same

services that web servers provide. One way is by caching web pages that are provided.

Proxy servers may also provide load balancing for web servers.

Because of these subtle differences it would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the features of the

proxy server into a web server. This combination would have produced predictable

results to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

Claim 11:

Formanek discloses the claimed features in Claim 1 (shown above).

Formanek discloses a system *characterized in that the adaptation module is integrated in a web server (12) delivering documents to mobile terminals (11)* [paragraph 0025, lines 15-20] [a proxy server delivers web pages or web document to a PDA].

The service that a proxy server provides may be easily integrated into a web server. This integration is possible because proxy servers often provide the same services that web servers provide, one way is by caching web pages. Proxy servers may also provide load balancing for web servers.

Because of these subtle differences it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the features of the proxy server into a web server. This combination would have produced predictable results to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

Claims 2, 9, 14, 15, 17 and 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Formanek as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Kaasila et al US Patent Number 7,222,306 (hereinafter, "Kaasila") and further in view of Ishikawa et al US Patent Number 6,011,877 (hereinafter, "Ishikawa").

Claim 2:

Formanek discloses all the claimed features in Claim 1.

Formanek fails to disclose:

a *method characterized in that the determination (21) of the processing and display capabilities of the terminal comprises a step of determining a display axis corresponding to an axis of a larger dimension of an image capable of being displayed by the terminal (11), wherein the analysis of the document page to be displayed comprises a step of determining a reading direction of the document page, and the conversion of the document page is followed by a step of adapting the image resulting from the conversion, consisting of making the reading direction of the document page coincide with the display axis of the terminal.*

Kaasila discloses:

a *method characterized in that the determination (21) of the processing and display capabilities of the terminal comprises a step of determining a display axis corresponding to an axis of a larger dimension of an image capable of being displayed by the terminal (11)* [col. 108, lines 28-35] [recognized the difference between machines with a portrait orientation and landscape orientation],

and the conversion of the document page is followed by a step of adapting the image resulting from the conversion, consisting of making the reading direction of the document page coincide with the display axis of the terminal [col. 108, lines 6-41] [recognizes the difference in resolution between portrait and landscape orientation and how to rotate the images 90 degrees to accommodate user].

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of determining terminal display capabilities disclosed in Formanek with the method for determining a display axis disclosed in Kaasila and modifying the document to be displayed on the proper axis.

This modification would have been useful to provide a reading layout customized more to the display abilities of the device.

Kaasila fails to disclose:

wherein the analysis of the document page to be displayed comprises a step of determining a reading direction of the document page,

Ishikawa discloses:

wherein the analysis of the document page to be displayed comprises a step of determining a reading direction of the document page [abstract] [determines directional orientation, or reading direction, based on punctuation or white space],

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of determining a reading direction in Ishikawa

into the methods of determining display abilities and displaying documents in Formanek
and Kaasila.

This modification would have been necessary to be able to display the
documents in a proper direction on the display.

Claim 14:

Formanek discloses the method *characterized in that it also includes a step (26)*
of extracting, from the image resulting from the conversion, a band of which the
dimensions correspond to the maximum dimensions of an image capable of being
displayed by the terminal [paragraph 0040, lines 8-12 and paragraph 0030, lines 7-9]
[maximum display width determined and target resolution, the band is the resultant
image with limited width], *and of which the orientation in the image corresponds to the*
reading axis of the document page, which image band is transmitted to the terminal
[paragraph 0045, lines 9-12 and fig. 4] [discloses the reading flow, or axis, in the same
fashion, or orientation, as the original document].

Claim 15:

Formanek discloses the method *characterized in that the resolution of the image*
generated by the conversion of a document page is determined on the basis of the size
of alphanumeric characters present in the document page and on the basis of the
dimensions of the page [paragraph 0040, lines 8-18 and paragraph 0042, lines 1-13]
[text font size is the equivalent of the size of alphanumeric characters].

Claim 17:

Kaasila discloses a method *characterized in that it includes a preliminary step of selecting a portion of a document page to be displayed on the screen of the terminal (11) including steps consisting of converting the document page into a reduced image having a format compatible with the processing and display capabilities of a terminal, and with a resolution selected so that the entire image can be displayed by the terminal, and transmitting the reduced image of the page to the terminal, wherein the user of the terminal then has the possibility of selecting an area of the displayed image, which selected area of the document page is then converted to a resolution selected on the basis of the characteristics of the document page, so that the contents of the document page can be read on the screen of the terminal* [col. 26, lines 39-49] [contents of the page adjusted by adjusting spacing and zoom to different sizes].

Claim 20:

Formanek discloses the method *characterized in that if the document page is an image representing text, the analysis of the document page includes steps of recognizing the alphanumeric characters present in the document page* [paragraph 0032, lines 1-10] [OCR software can identify the location of text and graphic blocks] *and determining a main size of the recognized alphanumeric characters, with the resolution of the image generated by the conversion of a document page being determined on the*

basis of the main size obtained [paragraph 0043, lines 1-16] [non-standard size text

such as headlines can be converted to normal size text].

Claim 9:

Formanek discloses all the claimed features in Claim 1.

Formanek fails to disclose:

a *method characterized in that the determination (21) of the processing and*

display capabilities of the terminal comprises a step of determining a display axis

corresponding to an axis of a larger dimension of an image capable of being displayed

by the terminal (11), wherein the analysis of the document page to be displayed

comprises a step of determining a reading direction of the document page, and the

conversion of the document page is followed by a step of adapting the image resulting

from the conversion, consisting of making the reading direction of the document page

coincide with the display axis of the terminal.

Kaasila discloses:

a *method characterized in that the determination (21) of the processing and*

display capabilities of the terminal comprises a step of determining a display axis

corresponding to an axis of a larger dimension of an image capable of being displayed

by the terminal (11) [col. 108, lines 28-35] [recognized the difference between

machines with a portrait orientation and landscape orientation],

and the conversion of the document page is followed by a step of adapting the

image resulting from the conversion, consisting of making the reading direction of the

document page coincide with the display axis of the terminal [col. 108, lines 6-41]

[recognizes the difference in resolution between portrait and landscape orientation and

how to rotate the images 90 degrees to accommodate user].

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to incorporate the system of determining terminal display capabilities

disclosed in Formanek with the system for determining a display axis disclosed in

Kaasila and modifying the document to be displayed on the proper axis.

This modification would have been useful to provide a reading layout customized

more to the display abilities of the device.

Kaasila fails to disclose:

wherein the analysis of the document page to be displayed comprises a step of

determining a reading direction of the document page,

Ishikawa discloses:

wherein the analysis of the document page to be displayed comprises a step of

determining a reading direction of the document page [abstract] [determines directional

orientation, or reading direction, based on punctuation or white space],

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to incorporate the method of determining a reading direction in Ishikawa

into the methods of determining display abilities and displaying documents in Formanek
and Kaasila.

This modification would have been necessary to be able to display the
documents in a proper direction on the display.

Claim 5 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Formanek
as applied to claims 1 and 4 above, in view of Kaasila et al US Patent Number
7,222,306 (hereinafter, "Kaasila").

Claim 5:

Formanek discloses all the claimed features in Claim 1.

Formanek fails to disclose:

a method *characterized in that it includes a preliminary step of selecting a portion*
of a document page to be displayed on the screen of the terminal (ii) including steps
consisting of converting the document page into a reduced image having a format
compatible with the processing and display capabilities of a terminal, and with a
resolution selected so that the entire image can be displayed by the terminal, and
transmitting the reduced image of the page to the terminal, wherein the user of the
terminal then has the possibility of selecting an area of the displayed image, which
selected area of the document page is then converted to a resolution selected on the
basis of the characteristics of the document page, so that the contents of the document
page can be read on the screen of the terminal.

Kaasila discloses:

a method *characterized in that it includes a preliminary step of selecting a portion of a document page to be displayed on the screen of the terminal (11)* [col. 26, lines 53-55] [a portion of a web page in a first scale, the user selects a portion] *including steps consisting of converting the document page into a reduced image having a format compatible with the processing and display capabilities of a terminal, and with a resolution selected so that the entire image can be displayed by the terminal* [col. 26, lines 21-25] [web page provided at a given resolution, with the ability to zoom], *and transmitting the reduced image of the page to the terminal, wherein the user of the terminal then has the possibility of selecting an area of the displayed image, which selected area of the document page is then converted to a resolution selected on the basis of the characteristics of the document page, so that the contents of the document page can be read on the screen of the terminal* [col. 26, lines 39-49] [contents of the page adjusted by adjusting spacing and zoom to different sizes].

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of selecting portions of a web page for viewing in Kaasila with the methods of converting documents to images for viewing in Formanek.

This combination would have been used to allow the user to view selected portions with a larger text size for easier viewing.

Claim 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Formanek

as applied to claims 1 and 3 above, in view of Kaasila et al US Patent Number

7,222,306 (hereinafter, "Kaasila").

Claim 18:

Formanek discloses all the claimed features in Claims 1 and 3.

Formanek fails to disclose:

a method *characterized in that it includes a preliminary step of selecting a portion*

of a document page to be displayed on the screen of the terminal (11) [col. 26, lines 53-

55] [a portion of a web page in a first scale, the user selects a portion] *including steps*

consisting of converting the document page into a reduced image having a format

compatible with the processing and display capabilities of a terminal, and with a

resolution selected so that the entire image can be displayed by the terminal [col. 26,

lines 21-25] [web page provided at a given resolution, with the ability to zoom]*, and*

transmitting the reduced image of the page to the terminal, wherein the user of the

terminal then has the possibility of selecting an area of the displayed image, which

selected area of the document page is then converted to a resolution selected on the

basis of the characteristics of the document page, so that the contents of the document

page can be read on the screen of the terminal.

Kaasila discloses:

a method *characterized in that it includes a preliminary step of selecting a portion*

of a document page to be displayed on the screen of the terminal (11) including steps

consisting of converting the document page into a reduced image having a format

compatible with the processing and display capabilities of a terminal, and with a

resolution selected so that the entire image can be displayed by the terminal, and

transmitting the reduced image of the page to the terminal, wherein the user of the

terminal then has the possibility of selecting an area of the displayed image, which

selected area of the document page is then converted to a resolution selected on the

basis of the characteristics of the document page, so that the contents of the document

page can be read on the screen of the terminal [col. 26, lines 39-49] [contents of the

page adjusted by adjusting spacing and zoom to different sizes].

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to incorporate the method of selecting portions of a web page for viewing

in Kaasila with the methods of converting documents to images for viewing in

Formanek.

This combination would have been used to allow the user to view selected

portions with a larger text size for easier viewing.

Claim 19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Formanek

as applied to claims 1 and 4 above, in view of Kaasila et al US Patent Number

7,222,306 (hereinafter, "Kaasila").

Claim 19:

Formanek discloses all the claimed features in Claims 1 and 4.

Formanek fails to disclose:

a method *characterized in that it includes a preliminary step of selecting a portion*

of a document page to be displayed on the screen of the terminal (11) [col. 26, lines 53-

55] [a portion of a web page in a first scale, the user selects a portion] *including steps*

consisting of converting the document page into a reduced image having a format

compatible with the processing and display capabilities of a terminal, and with a

resolution selected so that the entire image can be displayed by the terminal [col. 26,

lines 21-25] [web page provided at a given resolution, with the ability to zoom], *and*

transmitting the reduced image of the page to the terminal, wherein the user of the

terminal then has the possibility of selecting an area of the displayed image, which

selected area of the document page is then converted to a resolution selected on the

basis of the characteristics of the document page, so that the contents of the document

page can be read on the screen of the terminal.

Kaasila discloses:

a method *characterized in that it includes a preliminary step of selecting a portion*

of a document page to be displayed on the screen of the terminal (11) including steps

consisting of converting the document page into a reduced image having a format

compatible with the processing and display capabilities of a terminal, and with a

resolution selected so that the entire image can be displayed by the terminal, and

transmitting the reduced image of the page to the terminal, wherein the user of the

terminal then has the possibility of selecting an area of the displayed image, which

selected area of the document page is then converted to a resolution selected on the

basis of the characteristics of the document page, so that the contents of the document

page can be read on the screen of the terminal [col. 26, lines 39-49] [contents of the

page adjusted by adjusting spacing and zoom to different sizes].

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to incorporate the method of selecting portions of a web page for viewing

in Kaasila with the methods of converting documents to images for viewing in

Formanek.

This combination would have been used to allow the user to view selected

portions with a larger text size for easier viewing.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin J. Smith whose telephone number is (571) 270-3825. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30AM-5:00PM EST..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on (571) 272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Benjamin J. Smith/
Examiner, Art Unit 2176

/Doug Hutton/
Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100